



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the Rheims Testament, having been published before the revision of the Vulgate by Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. (1590-92), follows the uncorrected and unauthorized Latin text. With respect to the Old Testament, the editors tell us in the Preface, that they "have again conferred this English translation, and conformed it to the most perfect Latin edition."

Thus, then, was completed what is called the Douay Bible. It has undergone many changes since. Those who may not have an opportunity of referring to the work in its original shape may wish to know the judgment pronounced on it by one of the most eminent biblical critics of the last century, and himself a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Geddes. "The English Catholics," he writes in the year 1793, "had no alternative for more than a century but to put up with a barbarous translation, made at Rheims and Douay, from an uncorrected copy of the Latin Vulgate, accompanied with virulent annotations against the Protestant religion, and manifestly calculated to support a system, not of genuine Catholicity, but of transalpine Popery." He adds, "About the middle of the present century (the 18th), it was indeed remodelled on the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, and modernised into somewhat better English by the late Dr. Chaloner, who put it into a more convenient form, and stript it of almost all its most odious notes; yet still, in those which he retained or altered, the spirit of theologic system is but too visible; and as to the translation itself, the changes in it are chiefly made from that same Common Version (the English authorised version) which had been so much vilified and burlesqued by our rhimers and divines."

During the century which Dr. Geddes alludes to, this "barbarous translation" does not appear to have been much read, inasmuch as we know, that between the second and third editions of the Old Testament no less an interval than 114 years elapsed; whilst between the fourth and fifth editions of the New Testament, the interval was 105 years.<sup>a</sup> This fact furnishes a striking comment on Dr. Doyle's assertion, above quoted—"We have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity of our Church."

The subsequent history of the Douay Bible we shall reserve for our next Number.

### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

WE have read somewhere what appears very worthy of reflection, that "if men are to hate and persecute one another on account of religion, it should be as amongst the people of Egypt, of whom one served one deity, and the other a different one."

"Inter finitimos vetus atque antiqua simul  
Immortale odium, et nunquam sanabile vulnus  
Ardet adhuc Ombos, et Tentrys; summus utriusque  
Unde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum  
Olit uterque locus, quum solos credat habendos  
Esse Deos, quos ipse colit."—*Juvenal*, 15 Sat. 33.<sup>a</sup>

That men, who worship the same Deity, and that a benignant one, should think they did their God service by persecuting and injuring one another would seem incomprehensible, if we did not know it by experience to be a lamentable truth.

The religion of Mahomet, we know, was undisguisedly propagated by the sword; and his followers were expressly enjoined to make use of force to destroy all other systems of religion. "When you meet with infidels," says Mahomet, in the 9th chapter of the Alcoran, "kill them, cut off their heads, or take them prisoners, and bind them till they have paid their ransom, or till you find it proper to set them at liberty. Do not be afraid to persecute them, till they have laid down their arms, and submitted to you."

The rule of Mahomet is that which has been most largely practised in the world, even by those who deny his authority, and denounce him as an impostor. Earnestness and intolerance have, indeed, generally gone hand in hand, and the way of the world, in general, has been to persecute all who differ from them.

The Gospel, on the other hand, enjoins the mildest and tenderest treatment towards those who oppose themselves to it. It frequently warns the disciples of Christ that they must suffer persecution; but it never tells them to return evil for evil, or authorises, much less enjoins, them to persecute their opponents, or compel them by fire or sword to embrace her faith and doctrine.

When Peter drew his sword in defence of our Lord himself, and struck the high priest's servant, Malchus, and cut off his right ear (an incident which was so much at variance with the whole tenor of the conduct of Christ and his followers, that it has been recorded by each of the four evangelists (Matt. xxvi., v. 51, Mark, xiv., v. 47, Luke, xxii., v. 49-51, John, xviii., v. 10, 11))—"Jesus rebuked him, saying, 'put up thy sword into the sheath, for all they that

take the sword shall perish with the sword; and he touched his ear and healed him."

Again, when the Samaritans would not receive him, and James and John, excited, doubtless, by their zeal, asked him, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did?" his reply was characteristic of the whole of his teaching, "He turned and rebuked him, and said, 'ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them; and they went to another village.'—Luke ix., 53 6.

Christians, instead of being commanded to persecute, were commanded only to preach and instruct, to be ever ready to give a reason for the faith that is in them, and in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves. Let us reflect a little, and see whether this method of Christ is not the only truly wise and philosophical one.

What is religion? and in what does it consist?

The essence of religion consists in the opinions which the mind forms of God, and the emotions of respect, fear, and love which we entertain towards him. It is in the interior disposition and inward persuasion of the mind that the essence of true and saving religion obviously consists. The Gospel, consequently, treats man as a reasonable being, endowed with a manly judgment, which can only be influenced and spiritualized by light and evidence and persuasion, not by external pressure. "It is one thing," says the great mental philosopher, Locke, "to persuade, another to command; one thing to prop with arguments, another with punishments. It is light and evidence only that can work a change in men's opinions, and that light can in no manner proceed from corporal sufferings, or any other outward penalties."

"No way whatsoever that I shall walk in against the dictates of my conscience," says the same eminent philosopher, "will ever bring me to the mansions of the blessed. I may gain rest by an act that I take not delight in; I may be cured of some disease by remedies that I have not faith in; but I cannot be saved by a religion that I distrust, and by a worship that I abhor. Faith only and inward sincerity are the things that procure acceptance with God, and there is no such way of propagating truth as when strong arguments and good reason are joined with softness of civility and good usage."

The nature of the human understanding is, indeed, such that it cannot be compelled to the belief of anything by outward force. "You might as well," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his forcible and quaint manner, "cure the colic by brushing a man's clothes, or fill his stomach with a syllogism, as attempt to convince his understanding by corporal afflictions. Force, in matters of opinion, can never do good, but is very apt to do harm, and make men hypocrites instead of believers, and so, instead of erecting a trophy to God and true religion, build a monument to the devil!"

"But it ceases not there. The use of force spreads further, and acts on others in the opposite direction to that desired. There is a popular pity that follows all persons in misery, and compassion often begets bitterness of affections, and that not unfrequently bitterness of persuasion, and so much the rather, because there arises a jealous and pregnant suspicion that they who persecute an opinion are destitute of sufficient arguments to confute it, and, therefore, find the hangman the best disputant."

It is, then, clear that the only practicable, as well as the only legitimate, way of inspiring such religion, is to apply persuasion, and such means and arguments as are calculated to lead the judgment in the way desired; and that to resort to threats, penalties, banishment, blows, or any other species of punishment, must be a false way of promoting any religion which has truth on its side and something better than persecution to recommend it to the world. External acts may, indeed, be compelled, and many men may readily be induced, by the apprehension of bodily sufferings or the loss of their temporal goods, hypocritically to conform to the religious ceremonies of the strongest party; but mere external acts of homage and honour, rendered by one who has no suitable sentiments towards the object to be worshipped, is no more a real honour to God than the prostration of a statue, overturned by the wind at the feet of a passing sovereign, would be a real homage by the statue to the king.

While, however, true philosophy and true Christianity so completely concur in this important matter, what a sad contrast has the practice of Christians exhibited even when compared with the despised followers of Mahomet!

The religious tenets of the latter expressly authorized and enjoined them to persecute; but the Saracens seem to have early discovered that the methods enjoined by their leader were not effectual ones—at least against Christianity. They soon, therefore, left off the violent methods, and the result is that the Greek Church, instead of being extinguished, has maintained itself to this day under the yoke of Mahomet. They have their Patriarchs, their Metropolitans, their synods, their discipline, and their monks. The contrast is a sad one, but we believe it to be not the less true, that there is no manner of comparison between the cruelty of the Saracens to the Christians, and that of some Christians, calling themselves, by way of exclusion, Catholics, towards other Christians whom they call heretics. In a few years of war against the Vaudois, or even in the massacre of St. Bartholomew alone, Christians shed more blood for the cause of religion than the

Saracens spilt in all their persecutions against the Christians. The Mahometans have, no doubt, in other ways, made the Christians pay very dear for their liberty of conscience; they imposed heavy tributes on them, and caused them frequently to redeem their churches, which they sometimes sold to the Jews, and afterwards obliged the Christians to buy back again; but it was the avarice of the Mahometans, rather than their cruelty, of which the Christians had reason to complain. It is a lamentable satire on Christianity, but we can scarcely dissent from the observations of the eminent French writer, who says upon this subject:—"One may be quite satisfied that if the Christians of the West had borne sway in Asia, in the room of the Saracens and Turks, there would not at this day remain the least traces of the Greek Church, nor would they have tolerated Mahometanism, as the infidels there have tolerated Christianity." Let us, however, inquire a little more closely into the matter, and, admitting that actual violence is neither legitimate nor efficacious as a means of inculcating religion, may there not still be limits and qualifications to the doctrine of universal toleration, which a wise and good government may adopt, and circumstances under which a resort to the secular arm may still be right and necessary?

In matters relating to social and moral duty, we, of course, do not deny the right of the civil power to interfere; for, obviously, no one has the right to propagate immoral or anti-social principles—principles which would undermine the foundations of civil society, and poison the fountains of public and private happiness at their source; but in matters of mere religious truth or falsehood, things which touch not the relations of man to man, but are matter between each man and his God, we hold they have no right whatever to interfere. It is no part of the duty of the civil government to uphold or to propagate religious truth—much less to punish those who differ from what it considers to be such; and if governments have no right or power to control or punish their subjects, assuredly individuals have no right to control or punish one another in matters of religious belief, where every man's conscience should be free to adopt and publicly to profess whatever opinions he is sincerely convinced are founded in truth.

But, how then, some will say, is truth to be maintained, when once adopted; if any one is to be at liberty to attack and undermine it without opposition or punishment?

One would think, from the anxiety which some persons express about truth, that it was made of very perishable materials, and had no inherent power whatever to protect itself. Such persons would preserve truth as if it were a china vessel, or rather as if, while as brilliant, it was also as brittle as glass. And yet how inconsistent are such persons in this matter. One day, they will, in the most sublime terms, represent truth to be as steady and immovable as a rock, and, at another time, they will tell us that it must be by no means exposed to the dangers of controversy, which is a most dangerous rock, on which truth is ever likely to split! Both of these things cannot be true; either the former is the mere language of bombast, in which such persons themselves do not believe, or the latter cowardly distrust, which does the greatest dishonour to the character of truth.

We never asserted, however, that every or any one ought to be at liberty to attack or undermine truth, without opposition. Let every opposition, every persuasion, every exertion, consistent with perfect freedom of conscience, be used to prevent men from abandoning what we believe to be the truth, and to induce others to abandon what we believe to be error. No zeal, no earnestness, no perseverance can be too great in a cause so sacred and so glorious. But that opposition should go beyond legitimate persuasion, which can and ought alone to operate upon the human mind, and degenerate into pains and penalties, which never did and never ought to influence any man's sincere opinions, there we commence our solemn protest, in the name of Jesus, whose whole life on earth was one continued practical exemplification of the sacred truth we are attempting to defend and illustrate, and a living personification of the humility, the patience, the meekness of the religion He came down from Heaven to teach, when He said unto his disciples—"Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls"—in the name of that Jesus who, so far from affording an example of compulsion, is compared to a lamb, led to the slaughter without a complaint—in the name of that Jesus who said, "Blessed are the meek, the peacemakers, the merciful, for theirs is the kingdom of God!"—Jesus who, in the midst of all the outrages committed on him, revenged not himself, but "committed Himself to him who judges righteously;" who commanded that we should bless those who curse us, and pray for those who despitefully use us and persecute us: we solemnly protest against any and every species of intolerance or coercion in matters of religion.

We might fill whole pages without exhausting a variety of the touching eloquence of the Gospel in support of this view, but we shall limit ourselves to but two examples more, which appear to be peculiarly illustrative of it. When Jesus was warning his disciples of the persecution which awaited them, far from permitting them to persecute the unbelievers in return, He distinctly tells them that they are to seek safety only in flight—"If they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another (Matt. x. 23). He does not say, try to raise an insurrection against those

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Geddes does not seem to attach much weight to the statement of the editors of the Douay Old Testament, to the effect that they had "conformed the translation to the most perfect Latin edition."

A second edition of the Douay Old Testament was published at Rouen, in 1635, being 25 years after the first. The next edition was that of Dr. Chaloner, in 1719. The fourth edition of the Rheims Testament was published in 1632; and the next in 1738.

<sup>b</sup> "An old grudge, to immortal hatred turned,

Between the Tentyrites and Ombites burned;

A wound in these two neighbour towns past cure;

Because that neither people will endure

Their neighbours' deities; nor will have more

Worship to be gods than they themselves adore."

who govern, call to your aid those cities which are friendly to you, and go and besiege those who have persecuted you, and compel them to join your faith; but He merely says, leave them, and betake yourselves to another place; or at most, "if they receive ye not in any city, go your ways out into the streets of the same and say, 'Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth to us, we wipe off against you, notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.'" (Luke x. 10-11.)

Again, to what does the Lord of our religion compare himself? To a shepherd who goes before his sheep, and calleth his sheep by name, and leadeth them out, and whose sheep follow him, for they know his voice. He does not say that He drives the flock before Him with blows or constraint, as if He would force them anywhere against their inclination; but He merely goes before them, and they follow Him, because they know Him, which marks the complete liberty which He gives them to follow Him, and that He desires only a voluntary obedience, preceded and grounded upon knowledge. He contrasts his mission with that of the thieves and robbers who would climb up into the sheepfold, and like wolves carry away the sheep by force who do not belong to them or know their voice. (John x. 1-14.)

It would require us to transcribe nearly the whole of the New Testament, if we would adduce all the proofs which it furnishes of the goodness, the mildness, and the patience which compose the essential and distinctive character of the Gospel, and negative the idea that it is ever justifiable to propagate it by force.

Still, some may say, may there not be a difference between our Lord's mode of dealing with Jews and Pagans, by whom He was surrounded, and the language He would have used if dealing with those who had once been his followers, and apostatized from the truth? Well; let us see. Did our Lord deal otherwise with his apostles, when, in the hour of his passion, they all forsook him and fled? Peter had solemnly denied him, all had deserted him, and yet, what were the first words he addressed to them after his resurrection? "The same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst;" and what did He say to them? Did He reproach and revile them? No; "Jesus," says the evangelist, "came and stood in the midst of them, and said unto them, PEACE be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed unto them his hands and his side, and said unto them again, PEACE be unto you." There is no exception or limit to the mildness of his precepts or example, and when He has drawn no such distinctions, let us not dare to make any.

Why, indeed, should there be any such distinctions? Can man be free to accept or reject a newly proposed religion, and not free to reject one already believed, though, perhaps, on insufficient grounds? Can it be in itself more criminal to give up an old religion (in which accident has brought us up, because we were born of parents or in a country where such a religion happened to prevail), when we think we see adequate reasons for abandoning it, than to adopt a new religion of whose truth we think we have sufficient proofs? Does not the very fact of adopting a new religion almost unavoidably involve the rejection of an old one? Every one thinks him an apostate who leaves his religion and conforms to another faith. To the Jews, the disciples must have appeared apostates from the religion of Moses and Abraham; the Mahometans deem converts to Christianity renegades and apostates; Protestants call those who leave the reformed Church to submit to the Pope perverts from the truth; Roman Catholics call those who reject their peculiar doctrines, and go over to the Church of England, heretics and apostates. In Ireland especially, Roman Catholics nickname converts by a number of other ignominious and insulting titles, and would have such men dealt with as if they were rebels against lawful authority; and, if they had the power, would invoke the secular arm against them, as freely as their co-religionists would do in Tuscany or Spain—(perhaps we may soon have to add) or Austria.

Numerous are the devices by which men attempt to conceal from themselves or others the absurd and wicked nature of their violations of religious liberty. The pretence of ecclesiastics generally is, that as gangrenes must be cut out and cauterized for the good of the body, heresy must be cauterized at any price, as undermining the very foundation of religion. Thus, men's bodies have been burned at the stake under pretence of saving their souls!—and the holy name of religion perverted, to afford a sanction to the worst passions and deepest prejudices of mankind.

There are many, however, who would shudder at the idea of the scaffold or the faggot, as means of converting men to the truth, who still think that any compulsory means short of actual violence or personal injury may be used; and who would, without scruple, adopt threats, or abuse, or exclusive dealing, or even priestly curses and altar denunciations, to deter others from following examples of which they disapprove.

We think, however, that all the arguments we have adduced both from Scripture and reason apply equally to every species of persecution, the pettiest as well as the most cruel. No mind was ever convinced, or heart converted, by petty persecution, any more than those of a graver kind. We cannot express sufficiently the strength and depth of

our conviction that all and every kind or degree of compulsion in religion is religious persecution, and equally contrary to the first principles of Christianity, and therefore to the will of the Supreme Being, who made all things, and who framed those eternal laws of right and wrong which should govern all men equally in all places and at all times.<sup>a</sup> We cannot believe that God's will is that Christians should treat Jews, Mahometans, or Pagans differently from the way that Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans should treat Christians—much less that any sect or section of Christians should treat another sect of Christians worse than it is their duty to treat Jews or Mahometans. The great golden rule of Christianity is as universal as it is wise and benevolent, "Whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also even so unto them." Were such a rule of conduct universally acted on, as no one without blasphemy can deny that it is God's will that it should be, the reign of truth would be nigh at hand, and persecution of every shade and colour banished from the earth.

## THE DUMB VILLAGE.

CHAP. I.

WHAT! do you really mean to say that there is a "Dumb Village?" How strange, and not more melancholy than strange. Where is this village? for we have never heard of it before. Did a sudden visitation fall on its inhabitants, or did some benevolent individual, impressed by their helplessness, gather together a colony of mutes, and locate them in some suitable spot, as we know to have been done with great success in the case of persons afflicted by a far more distressing malady?

The latter would be an easy and a happy solution of this strange circumstance. But, unfortunately, it will not, since it is not true, assist our conjectures. Nothing of the kind occurred. No such eclectic benevolence was exercised. The greater part of these poor people became dumb under circumstances extremely interesting, and so perplexing as to render the fact wholly unparalleled in the annals of medical observation, and, as yet, certainly inexplicable by medical science. For it is truly said that dumbness does not, ordinarily at least, arise from any impediment in the organ of speech, but from a defect in that of hearing. No doubt, it would sound very strange to say that people speak with their ears. But it may, nevertheless, be quite correct, though it may appear very odd, to assert that they speak because of their ears. Since, if they cannot hear sounds, they certainly will not try to imitate them, and hence will not acquire the use of language. Thus it is that we so often find the same persons to be both "deaf and dumb." Not because both tongues and ears are really defective, but "dumb" because they are "deaf."

We cannot, then, explain this strange fact on medical grounds. For it is one of the many curious circumstances connected with this village, that its inhabitants had perfectly uninjured organs of hearing, and were, moreover, very fond of listening. You might at once perceive, though they did not reply to any questions you asked, they understood every word you uttered. This was especially plain with the younger women, whose bright eyes often beamed with intelligence, and not unfrequently seemed literally to sparkle with fun, as you addressed them, leaving you in dire amazement that such youthful creatures—or, indeed, that any women at all (for, of course, it would not be near so strange with men)—should seem to consider their deprivation of speech not merely as no misfortune at all, but quite as an occasion of most unaccountable merriment. As if the affliction under which they were suffering was really no trial whatever, but rather as the drollest thing imaginable.

Some among the men indeed—especially the elder ones—seemed duly impressed with a sense of their condition. For they would often hurry past you with a quick step, with a downcast, and sometimes a dark look, as though they would either deprecate or prohibit the sympathy which you naturally felt for them, and repress all inquiry into the causes of their affliction. They did not seem as if they wanted to be pitied, or wished to be questioned. That they should desire to avoid the latter was intelligible enough, but that they should thus repel the sympathy which their condition occasioned was in no small degree perplexing. Because it is an exception to the conduct of most people, who naturally welcome the compassion which soothes their suffering.

Some of the women, too—though it must be admitted they were, as well as the men, but few—regarded you, when passing them, with a look of anger and hatred, as if you were the cause of their affliction. No doubt, it must be allowed it is a heavy trial on most women to be compelled to hold their tongues at any time whatever. And, to judge from appearances, these women seemed to be of the class. For you could see their lips open as if on the point of uttering some expression of deep ill will which their countenances showed they felt, and then closed as suddenly as if their jaws were steel traps. Leaving you quite puzzled to conjecture what it

was which stopped them—whether actual inability to speak, or that something at that instant flashed upon their minds and silenced them. And so your next thought was: "Well, if that woman had only the use of her tongue, I would not be her husband for a trifle."

The younger women were, however, the genuine puzzles. If one of these grim old philosophers who spent his time in the study of human nature, and thought he knew a great deal about it, was suddenly popped into this village, and asked his opinion of its maidens, the likelihood is, that at the end he would have shaved off his long beard—if in his perplexity he had not torn it out by the roots—and gone to school again to get birched by Madam Philosophy for the disgrace which, through his ignorance, he had brought on that good old dame's teaching.

These young women were, indeed, as we have said, "riddles," and very pretty riddles too, in every sense of the word. For, of course, we should naturally conclude, that to the "female sex" the loss of their tongues would be, under any circumstances, a matter of overwhelming distress, and incapable of any mitigation. Seeing that those who had husbands were thus prevented from scolding them, and those who still looked for them—and this division includes, it is presumed, every woman that has been, or shall be born—were precluded from the prospective enjoyment of doing so. Yet, though thus defrauded of that happiness which matrons enjoy, and maidens anticipate, these laughing girls made light of a misfortune which deprived them of "the rights of women," to the great diminution, however, of the "wrongs of man." "Light" they certainly did make of it; and as to considering it a misfortune, you would, at least if you were an Irishman, have assuredly concluded that the only purpose which ever brought a tear into their eyes was to temper their brilliancy with tenderness. Nay, more, you would almost have sworn that the ripe and laughing lips, so cruelly debarred from uttering a word as you passed, must have been flowing over with fun but a moment before. Sorrow for the loss of their tongues sat lightly enough upon them. They rather seemed, in their manifest efforts to look demure, as though the restraint of silence was more a source of mirth than an occasion of sadness. In short, the "dumb girls" appeared to be perversely amused by your perplexity, when they ought, no doubt, have been very much sobered by their own misfortune. It was, moreover, very strange that, should you chance to come upon a group of them unobserved, you would have been, in no small degree, surprised at the seeming confusion which your presence caused. Your ears, too, must have cheated you. Because you were tolerably certain you had heard busy voices but an instant before. Perhaps there are fairies elsewhere, as in Ireland. And that it was their voices you heard, expressing to each other how much they admired these pretty maidens, and pitied them.

Puzzles and perplexity met you on all sides. For, if you entered one of the cottages, it seemed as though you had brought the plague along with you. You had been almost certain you heard the merry voices of children at play, and yet, scarcely had your foot crossed the threshold, when you saw the little things shrink away, casting frightened looks upon you, and clapping their hands to their mouths, as if afraid the first cry they uttered would certainly be the signal for such a "raw head and bloody bones," as they plainly took you to be, to devour them at a mouthful, curly locks and all. The father, too, was stiff, and the mother was starch. Nay, even the very dog seemed doubtful whether he was altogether right in not barking at you. For his very attitude of ambiguous irresolution seemed to intimate, as plainly, at all events, as a dog could say anything, "You see how I am restrained by some very strong considerations. So that if I give you 'none of my jaw,' it is only because, like my master, I am but 'a dumb dog' after all."

Of course, under such circumstances, you could not reasonably expect to be asked "to take a chair," though you were not aware of any cause why, in common courtesy, you should not be handed one, and motioned at least to sit down and rest yourself. And, in truth, you could not go into many of these cottages without soon seeing that some painful struggle was really going on in the mind of the good man, or better woman of the house upon this very point. Not only was this apparent; but, when you left the place, wholly surprised, partly grieved, and partly displeased, at such unexpected discourtesy, your retiring ears caught something very like the sounds of an indignant voice—"This is too bad; I won't stand it any longer!" or, as if to confound you utterly, something of a child's whisper, "Mammy, may I speak now?" Here was clearly a fresh dilemma for you; and another singularity which must be mentioned among the many strange characteristics of this most eccentric village. For we conclude our readers will have now anticipated that the inhabitants, old or young, could not have been born dumb, but, on the contrary, must have become so, only after they had learned the use of their mother tongue. This conjecture would have been quite correct. But they will also not fail to notice how much it adds to the great interest which, from what we have already stated, plainly belongs to this very peculiar case. For, as if to complete the physiological puzzle, and utterly confound all hope

<sup>a</sup> "This mode," says Locke, speaking of toleration, "pleases me, because it is capable of universal application; it is dealing equally with all mankind, is direct, and will hold good everywhere; which I take to be a good mark of truth. For I shall always suspect that neither to comport with the truth of religion, or the design of the Gospel which is suited to only some one country or party. What is true and good in England, will be true and good at Rome too, in China or Geneva."